

Dear,

We would like to extend our sincere thanks to the referees for the valuable help they provided. We found the comments encouraging and appropriate. They have significantly helped to improve the text and make the research more compelling in its arguments and especially in regard to the literature review and the connection to sustainability. The core changes compared to the previous version of the article can be found in different sections of the article: 1. Introduction (extended literature review on creativity and strengthening the link to sustainability by exposing the gap in literature on creativity regarding creative networks), 2.3 Methodology (including a description of the quadruple helix model and its importance for the methodological approach of the article), 3.2 Value network mapping (describing Figure 2 in more detail), 3.3 Value networks' value flows (discussing more in detail the importance of intangible value network for the sustainable impact of creative networks on territories/cities), 4 Conclusions and recommendations (including recommendations for further research into creative networks that draws on sustainability aspects). Below we present in more detail how we have made changes to the article based on the reviewers' comments.

Reviewer 1:

This is a very good paper which is very well written and neatly structured. The paper is also well referenced, except for one area. This is the very first paragraph which focuses on creativity giving an overview of the shift in thinking on this topic. There is a large body of research literature that could be referred to as succinctly as was done for networks in the first part of section 2.2. With these additions this would give solid authority to the assertion being made in this first para. This is important as this introductory section is used to justify the paper's concentration on networks. What will be revealed even with a cursory dive into the very extensive literature on creativity is that the push into collective creativity does not just end with distributed creativity, as important as that is, but has moved well beyond that, seeing creativity in terms of creative systems. This is far more compelling for justifying the types of creative networks discussed in the latter part of the paper. As a very cursory introduction to that literature read: Alexander, V. (2003). Sociology of the arts: exploring fine and popular forms. Malden MA: Blackwell. Hennessey, B. (2017) 'Taking a Systems View of Creativity: On the Right Path Toward Understanding' The Journal of Creative Behavior - Special Issue: In Celebration of the Journal of Creative Behavior's 50th Anniversary, 51(4), pp. 341–344. Hennessy, B. & Amabile, T. (2010) 'Creativity', Annual Review of Psychology, N61, pp. 569–598 Sawyer, K. (2012) Explaining creativity: The Science of Human Innovation 2nd ed (Oxford: Oxford Apart from this inclusion, which is easily completed, I think the paper is certainly well worth publishing.

Thank you very much for the positive feedback regarding the quality of the paper and for suggesting the need to go deeper into the existing research literature on creativity. We extended the literature review on creativity by referencing the authors suggested. In addition, we briefly discussed the core systems-based approaches of creativity and the models developed under this framework (Ref. No. 2-22). We also linked creativity to collective accounts of creativity and territorial forms of creativity that refer to the concept of creative cities and furthermore to aspects of sustainability (ref. 23-33).